DOCUMENT RESUME

ED 173 611 CE 022 181

AUTHOR Daugherty, Ronald D.; And Others
TITLE Results of Vocational Education Inservice Training. Needs Assessment Survey.
INSTITUTION Northern Inst. for Research, Training, and Development, Inc., Anchorage, Alaska.
SPONS AGENCY Alaska State Dept. of Education, Juneau.
PUB DATE [78]
NOTE 103p.

EDRS PRICE MF01/PC05 Plus Postage.
DESCRIPTORS Educational Administration; Educational Needs; *Educational Objectives; *Inservice Education; *Needs Assessment; Teacher Education; Teaching Methods; *Vocational Education
IDENTIFIERS *Alaska

ABSTRACT

A vocational education inservice training needs assessment survey was conducted among secondary school principals, teachers, superintendents, coordinators, and teacher aides throughout the state of Alaska. Individuals were asked to rate their own needs for inservice training in various areas of vocational education, the methods of inservice training which they preferred, and their ratings of the importance of several characteristics of inservice training. Among the survey results are the following: "vocational education in emerging occupations" was ranked highest by a majority of all principals and teachers in the area of inservice training needs; in regard to methods, a majority of teachers and coordinators ranked demonstration of materials or methods as first preference; and the majority of principals, teachers, and coordinators ranked the following as the higher of the important characteristics of vocational education inservice training: "inservice training should improve classroom performance," "inservice training should acquaint teachers with new materials and innovations," and "inservice training should be based on specific objectives." (A copy of the survey instrument is included in the document.) (JH)

****
* Reproductions supplied by EDRS are the best that can be made *
* from the original document. *
****

ED173611

Results

of

Vocational Education Inservice Training

Needs Assessment Survey

Ronald D. Daugherty
Raymond H. Lehrman
Susan E. Sloan

The Northern Institute for Research, Training
and Development, Anchorage, Alaska

in cooperation with

Office for Vocational and Career Education
Instructional Program Support Division
Alaska State Department of Education

U S DEPARTMENT OF HEALTH,
EDUCATION & WELFARE
NATIONAL INSTITUTE OF
EDUCATION

THIS DOCUMENT HAS BEEN REPRODUCED EXACTLY AS RECEIVED FROM THE PERSON OR ORGANIZATION ORIGINATING IT. POINTS OF VIEW OR OPINIONS STATED DO NOT NECESSARILY REPRESENT OFFICIAL NATIONAL INSTITUTE OF EDUCATION POSITION OR POLICY

CE 022 181

This report was developed pursuant to a grant from the Alaska State Department of Education. However, the opinions expressed herein do not necessarily reflect the position or policy of the Alaska State Department of Education, and no official endorsement should be inferred.

Table of Contents

Page Number

INTRODUCTION 1

METHODOLOGY FOR REPORTING 1

REPORTING THE RESULTS 3

Introduction 3
Section I, Needs: All Districts 4
Section I, Needs: High/Low, All Districts 10
Section I, Needs: Ranked from Highest to Lowest, All Districts 12
Section I, Needs: Comparisons Between Districts 14
Section I, Needs: High/Low, Urban, Rural, and Semi-Rural Districts 30
Section I, Needs: Ranked from Highest to Lowest, Urban, Rural, and Semi-Rural Districts 32
Section II, Methods: All Districts 36
Section II, Methods: Preferred/Not Preferred, All Districts 39
Section II, Methods: Ranked from Highest to Lowest, All Districts 41
Section II, Methods: Comparisons Between Districts 43
Section II, Methods: Preferred/Not Preferred, Urban, Rural, and Semi-Rural Districts 50
Section II, Methods: Ranked from Highest to Lowest, Urban, Rural, and Semi-Rural Districts 52
Section III, Characteristics: All Districts 56
Section III, Characteristics: Important/Not Important, All Districts 59
Section III, Characteristics: Ranked from Highest to Lowest, All District.61
Section III, Characteristics: Comparisons Between Districts 63
Section III, Characteristics: Important/Not Important, Urban, Rural, and Semi-Rural Districts 70
Section III, Characteristics: Ranked from Highest to Lowest, Urban, Rural, and Semi-Rural Districts 72

ANALYSIS OF THE DATA 76

CONCLUSION 80

APPENDIX A - SURVEY INSTRUMENT 81

INTRODUCTION

In November, 1978, a Vocational Education Survey was conducted among secondary school principals, teachers, superintendents, coordinators, and teachers aides throughout the State of Alaska. Individuals were asked to rate their <u>own</u> needs for inservice training in various areas of vocational education, the methods of inservice training which they preferred, and their ratings of the importance of several characteristics of inservice training. All secondary school vocational education coordinators in the state were contacted by telephone to inform them of the survey's importance, to acquire the number of survey instruments needed for their districts, and to request their support for the project. The coordinators were then sent a letter giving instructions as to how to complete the survey and enough surveys to distribute to all vocational education personnel in their districts. The coordinators identified the vocational education personnel and distributed the surveys to them. As a result of this distribution, 576 surveys were distributed to coordinators throughout the state, and 332 responses were received, giving a 57.6% rate of return. Of the respondents, 268 were teachers, 23 were coordinators, 20 were principals, three were superintendents, and one was a teacher aide. Seventeen respondents did not indicate their titles. A copy of the survey instrument and the cover letter are included in Appendix A, as well as a list of districts from which respondents reported.

METHODOLOGY FOR REPORTING

A computer analysis of the respondent data was completed at the conclusion of the study. Figure 1 provides a sample of a computer

FILE NONAME (CREATION DATE = 01/09/79)

* C R O S S T A B U L A T I O N O F *
V6 GUIDANCE TECHNIQUES FOR VOC. ED. BY V2 POSITION
* * * * * * * * * * * * * * * * * * * \

printout of a single item, "Guidance Techniques for Vocational Education."

The problem was to report the statistical results from the computer printout in easy-to-read, meaningful form which would facilitate reader comprehension of the results of the survey. Therefore it was decided to forego the use of statistical terminology and attempt a plain-language report of survey outcomes and comparisons.

Judging What Information to Report. An examination of Figure 1 shows that four sets of information are given at four levels of value. That is, under the four value levels of "little needed", "some need", "needed", and "highly needed", the printout gives the number of respondents under each job title heading: principals, teachers, superintendents, coordinators, aides, and others ("others" refers to respondents who did not identify their job titles). The printout gives three percentage figures, also shown in Figure 1.

Of the three percentage figures, it was decided to use the column percent as the reporting figure. This figure indicates the percentage of each group (principals, teachers, superintendents, etc.) which marked an item at a particular level of value (little needed, some needed, needed, or highly needed). If there was a tie (for example, 50% of principals indicated "highly needed" and 50% marked "needed"), both levels of need were reported.

Reporting the highest percent for each job title made it possible to compare the responses of principals, teachers, superintendents, coordinators, aides, and others. However, there were only three superintendents and one aide who responded to the entire survey. There

were also seventeen "others" whose job titles were not reported. It was therefore decided to drop the responses from these position titles, for this particular analysis, and to report only on the responses of the 20 principals, 268 teachers, and 23 coordinators who completed the survey.

It should be noted again that the survey instructions directed individuals to indicate their own needs. That is, principals and coordinators were to rate their own needs for inservice training, not the needs they perceived teachers to have.

The survey instrument included a section in which respondents could indicate for each item whether they had had training or whether they would like training. Many respondents checked both boxes, making interpretation very difficult. Therefore, the responses to these questions were not included.

Very few of the educators surveyed responded to items #29 or #30. Reporting the responses of the majority of each group to these items would have been misleading, so the results of these items have been omitted from the following reports.

REPORTING THE RESULTS

Introduction. There are three components in the survey. Section I deals with respondents' reported levels of need for vocational education inservice training. Section II covers the preferred methods of vocational education inservice training identified by the respondents. Section III delineates the importance of each of a list of characteristics of vocational education inservice training. The results of survey Sections I, II, and III are provided sequentially in this report.

Survey results data were computer cross-tabulated to provide results for the following populations: 1) All Districts, 2) Urban Districts, 3) Rural Districts, and 4) Semi-Rural Districts. For this report, "urban" refers to combined data from Anchorage and Fairbanks school districts. "Rural" describes data from the 21 Rural Education Attendance Area (REAA) school districts. Data from all other "city" and "borough" school districts are termed "semi-rural".

Section I, Needs: All Districts

The following list answers the question: "What level of need for vocational education inservice training is assigned to each of 28 items by a majority of principals, teachers, and coordinators from all districts? The position of each named respondent group, e.g., principals, shows the level of need reported by the majority of persons from that group who answered the item. Where a group was equally di ded in stated level of need, the group's name may appear more than once. For example, in item #3, coordinators is listed alongside both "Needed" and "Some need". This shows that one half of the coordinators voted for each of these two levels of need. (See item #7 and item #12, where principals were divided into thirds in their response levels.)

LIST 1: Level of Need Reported
by
Principals, Teachers, and Coordinators
from
All Districts

Item #1: Guidance and counseling techniques

Highly needed			
Needed			
Some need	Principals	Teachers	Coordinators
Little needed			

Item #2: Effective utilization of resources

Highly needed			
Needed		Teachers	
Some need	Principals		Coordinators
Little needed			

Item #3: Vocational education for disadvantaged students

Highly needed			Coordinators
Needed	Principals		
Some need		Teachers	Coordinators
Little needed			

Item #4: Elimination of sex bias

Highly needed			
Needed			
Some need			
Little needed	Principals	Teachers	Coordinators

Item #5: Vocational education in emerging occupations

Highly needed		Teachers	Coordinators
Needed	Principals		
Some need			
Little needed			

Item #6: Vocational education for handicapped students

Highly needed			
Needed	Principals		Coordinators
Some need		Teachers	
Little needed			

Item #7: Using behavioral objectives in planning

Highly needed			
Needed	Principals		
Some need	Principals		
Little needed	Principals	Teachers	Coordinators

Item #8: Translating student needs into goals and objectives

Highly needed			
Needed	Principals		
Some need			Coordinators
Little needed		Teachers	Coordinators

Item #9: Humanizing the vocational education classroom

Highly needed			
Needed			
Some need			
Little needed	Principals	Teachers	Coordinators

Item #10: Interpersonal communications

Highly needed			
Needed			
Some need			
Little needed	Principals	Teachers	Coordinators

Item #11: Tests and measurement techniques

Highly needed			
Needed			
Some need	Principals		Coordinators
Little needed		Teachers	

Item #12: Monitoring student progress

Highly needed			
Needed	Principals		
Some need	Principals		
Little needed	Principals	Teachers	Coordinators

Item #13: Grading and reporting

Highly needed			
Needed			
Some need			
Little needed	Principals	Teachers	Coordinators

Item #14: Questioning techniques

Highly needed			
Needed			
Some need		Teachers	
Little needed	Principals		Coordinators

Item #15: Individualized instruction

Highly needed			
Needed			Coordinators
Some need	Principals		
Little needed	Principals	Teachers	

Item #16: Teacher-student relations

Highly needed			
Needed			
Some need			Coordinators
Little needed	Principals	Teachers	

Item #17: Use of audio-visual materials

Highly needed			
Needed			
Some need			
Little needed	Principals	Teachers	Coordinators

Item #18: Teacher-made instructional materials

Highly needed			
Needed			
Some need			
Little needed	Principals	Teachers	Coordinators

Item #19: Computer-assisted instruction

Highly needed			
Needed	Principals		
Some need			
Little needed		Teachers	Coordinators

Item #20: Program articulation and coordination

Highly needed			
Needed	Principals		Coordinators
Some need			
Little needed	Principals	Teachers	

Item #21: Peer tutoring

Highly needed			
Needed			
Some need		Teachers	
Little needed	Principals		Coordinators

Item #22: Parent-teacher conferences

Highly needed			
Needed			
Some need			
Little needed	Principals	Teachers	Coordinators

Item #23: Record keeping

Highly needed			
Needed			
Some need			
Little needed	Principals	Teachers	Coordinators

Item #24: Utilization of educational television

Highly needed			
Needed			Coordinators
Some need			
Little needed	Principals	Teachers	Coordinators

Item #25: Improving pupil achievement motivation

Highly needed			
Needed	Principals	Teachers	Coordinators
Some need			
Little needed			

Item #26: Utilization of paraprofessionals

Highly needed			
Needed	Principals	Teachers	Coordinators
Some need		Teachers	
Little needed			

Item #27: Techniques for dealing with cultural differences

Highly needed			
Needed	Principals	Teachers	Coordinators
Some need			
Little needed	Principals		

Item #28: Providing for students with limited academic development

Highly needed	Principals		Coordinators
Needed	Principals	Teachers	
Some need			
Little needed			

Section I, Needs: High/Low, All Districts

Table 1, following, answers the question, "Which vocational education inservice training items are rated as high and low by a majority of principals, teachers, and coordinators from all districts?" For this table, responses distributed between "highly needed" and "needed" were reported as having a "high level of need". Responses distributed between "some need" and "little needed" were reported as having a "low level of need". The items whose numbers are provided in Table I are listed in Appendix A.

TABLE 1: Inservice Training Needs Rated as High and Low
by
Principals, Teachers, and Coordinators
from
All Districts

Items Rated as High

Principals			3		5	6											19						25	26		28		
Teachers					5																		25			28		
Coordinators	1		3		5									15			19	20					25	26	27	28		

Items Rated as Low

Principals	1	2		4		7	8	9	10	11	12	13	14	15	16	17	18		20	21	22	23	24			27		
Teachers	1	2	3	4	6	7	8	9	10	11	12	13	14	15	16	17	18	19	20	21	22	23	24		26	27		
Coordinators		2	3	4	6	7	8	9	10	11	12	13	14	15	16	17	18	19		21	22	23	24					

Section I, Needs: Ranked from Highest to Lowest, All Districts

Table 2 , following, answers the question, "What is the ranking of the 28 vocational education inservice training items, from highest to lowest, based upon majority responses from principals, teachers, and coordinators from all districts?" This simple table is useful in that it enables determination at a glance to identify the highest, next-highest, etc. on down to the lowest order of value placed on the items by the respondents in each group. Items whose numbers are printed in the table are listed in Appendix A.

TABLE 2: Comparison: Vocational Education Inservice Training Items
Ranked from Highest to Lowest
by
Principals, Teachers, and Coordinators
from
All Districts

Rank	Principals	Teachers	Coordinators
1	5	5	25
2	3,25,28	25	5
3	6,19,26	28	28
4	8,27	2	1,20,26,27
5	1,2,16,20	3,15,26	3,15,19
6	7,9,12,14,15	1,6	6
7	11,18,24	8,18	2,16,18,21,24
8	10,13	19	12
9	17,21,22,23	27	10,11,17,23
10	4	11	8,9,14
11		20	22
12		12	13
13		14	4
14		9	7
15		17	
16		10	
17		24	
18		21	
19		7,13	
20		16	
21		23	
22		22	
23		4	

Section I, Needs: Comparisons Between Districts

The preceding list and tables provided information on the responses of all educators who completed Section I of the survey. The following lists give information on the responses of educators from urban, rural and semi-rural school districts. List 2 compares the responses of principals, teachers, and coordinators from rural and urban school districts, List 3 compares the responses of educators from urban and semi-rural districts, and List 4 compares responses of rural and semi-rural educators.

The position of the words "urban", "rural", and "semi-rural" under each position title (principals, teachers, and coordinators) indicates the level of response given by the majority of those in each classification. The word "both" means that educators from both groups being compared agreed on a particular level of need. In item #1 of List 2, for example, rural principals were split in their ratings of the level of need they had for training in guidance and counseling techniques. One third of the majority of rural principals felt such training was "highly needed", one third felt training was "little needed" and one third indicated "some need"for training. The majority of urban principals felt they had "some need" for such training. The majority of both urban and rural teachers agreed they had "some need" for training in guidance and counseling techniques, as did the majority of urban and rural coordinators.

LIST 2: Level of Need Reported
by
Principals, Teachers, and Coordinators
from
Rural and Urban Districts

Item #1: Guidance and counseling techniques

	Principals	Teachers	Coordinators
Highly needed	Rural		
Needed			
Some need	Both	Both	Both
Little needed	Rural		

Item #2: Effective utilization of resources

	Principals	Teachers	Coordinators
Highly needed			Urban
Needed	Urban	Urban	
Some need	Rural	Rural	Rural
Little needed			

Item #3: Vocational education for disadvantaged students

	Principals	Teachers	Coordinators
Highly needed			Both
Needed	Both	Rural	Rural
Some need		Both	Both
Little needed		Rural	Urban

Item #4: Elimination of sex bias

	Principals	Teachers	Coordinators
Highly needed			Rural
Needed			Rural
Some need			
Little needed	Both	Both	Both

Item #5: Vocational education in emerging occupations

	Principals	Teachers	Coordinators
Highly needed	Rural	Rural	Urban
Needed	Urban	Urban	
Some need	Rural		Rural
Little needed			

Item #6: Vocational education for handicapped students

	Principals	Teachers	Coordinators
Highly needed			Rural
Needed	Both		Rural
Some need		Both	Rural
Little needed	Rural		Urban

Item #7: Using behavioral objectives in planning

	Principals	Teachers	Coordinators
Highly needed			
Needed	Urban		Rural
Some need	Both		
Little needed	Urban	Both	Urban

Item #8: Translating student needs into goals and objectives

	Principals	Teachers	Coordinators
Highly needed			
Needed	Rural	Rural	
Some need	Both		Rural
Little needed	Rural	Urban	Urban

Item #9: Humanizing the vocational education classroom

	Principals	Teachers	Coordinators
Highly needed			Rural
Needed	Rural	Rural	
Some need	Urban	Rural	Rural
Little needed	Urban	Urban	Both

Item #10: Interpersonal communications

	Principals	Teachers	Coordinators
Highly needed			
Needed			Rural
Some need	Urban		Rural
Little needed	Rural	Both	Both

Item #11: Tests and measurement techniques

	Principals	Teachers	Coordinators
Highly needed			Rural
Needed	Rural		
Some need	Both	Rural	Both
Little needed	Rural	Urban	Both

Item #12: Monitoring student progress

	Principals	Teachers	Coordinators
Highly needed			Rural
Needed	Urban		
Some need	Urban	Rural	Rural
Little needed	Rural	Urban	Both

Item #13: Grading and reporting

	Principals	Teachers	Coordinators
Highly needed			Rural
Needed	Urban		
Some need		Rural	Rural
Little needed	Both	Urban	Both

Item #14: Questioning techniques

	Principals	Teachers	Coordinators
Highly needed			
Needed	Urban		Rural
Some need		Rural	
Little needed	Rural	Urban	Urban

Item #15: Individualized instruction

	Principals	Teachers	Coordinators
Highly needed	Urban		
Needed	Urban		Rural
Some need	Rural	Rural	
Little needed	Urban	Urban	Urban

Item #16: Teacher-student relations

	Principals	Teachers	Coordinators
Highly needed			
Needed	Urban		Rural
Some need			Rural
Little needed	Rural	Both	Both

Item #17: Use of audio-visual materials

	Principals	Teachers	Coordinators
Highly needed			
Needed			Rural
Some need			
Little needed	Both	Both	Urban

Item #18: Teacher-made instructional materials

	Principals	Teachers	Coordinators
Highly needed			Rural
Needed			Rural
Some need			
Little needed	Both	Both	Both

Item #19: Computer-assisted instruction

	Principals	Teachers	Coordinators
Highly needed			Rural
Needed	Urban		Rural
Some need			
Little needed	Both	Both	Both

Item #20: Program articulation and coordination

	Principals	Teachers	Coordinators
Highly needed			
Needed			Urban
Some need	Urban	Rural	Rural
Little needed	Rural	Urban	

Item #21: Peer tutoring

	Principals	Teachers	Coordinators
Highly needed			
Needed			
Some need	Rural	Rural	Rural
Little needed	Both	Urban	Urban

Item #22: Parent-teacher conferences

	Principals	Teachers	Coordinators
Highly needed			
Needed			
Some need			Rural
Little needed	Both	Both	Urban

Item #23: Record keeping

	Principals	Teachers	Coordinators
Highly needed			
Needed			Rural
Some need			Rural
Little needed	Both	Both	Both

Item #24: Utilization of educational television

	Principals	Teachers	Coordinators
Highly needed			
Needed			Rural
Some need	Rural		
Little needed	Both	Both	Urban

Item #25: Improving pupil achievement motivation

	Principals	Teachers	Coordinators
Highly needed			Urban
Needed	Both	Both	Urban
Some need	Rural		Rural
Little needed	Rural		

Item #26: Utilization of paraprofessionals

	Principals	Teachers	Coordinators
Highly needed			Urban
Needed	Urban	Urban	Urban
Some need	Both	Rural	Both
Little needed		Rural	

Item #27: Techniques for dealing with cultural differences

	Principals	Teachers	Coordinators
Highly needed			
Needed		Urban	Rural
Some need	Urban	Rural	
Little needed	Rural		Urban

Item #28: Providing for students with limited academic development

	Principals	Teachers	Coordinators
Highly needed			Both
Needed	Urban	Urban	Rural
Some need		Rural	Rural
Little needed	Rural		

LIST 3: Level of Need Reported
by
Principals, Teachers, and Coordinators
from
Urban and Semi-Rural Districts

Item #1: Guidance and counseling techniques

	Principals	Teachers	Coordinators
Highly needed			Semi-Rural
Needed	Semi-Rural		Semi-Rural
Some need	Urban	Urban	Urban
Little needed		Semi-Rural	

Item #2: Effective utilization of resources

	Principals	Teachers	Coordinators
Highly needed	Semi-Rural		Urban
Needed	Both	Both	
Some need			Semi-Rural
Little needed			

Item #3: Vocational education for disadvantaged students

	Principals	Teachers	Coordinators
Highly needed	Semi-Rural		Urban
Needed	Urban		
Some need		Both	Both
Little needed			Urban

Item #4: Elimination of sex bias

	Principals	Teachers	Coordinators
Highly needed			
Needed			
Some need	Semi-Rural		
Little needed	Both	Both	Both

Item #5: Vocational education in emerging occupations

	Principals	Teachers	Coordinators
Highly needed		Semi-Rural	Both
Needed	Both	Urban	Semi-Rural
Some need			Semi-Rural
Little needed			Semi-Rural

Item #6: Vocational education for handicapped students

	Principals	Teachers	Coordinators
Highly needed		Semi-Rural	Semi-Rural
Needed	Urban		
Some need		Urban	
Little needed	Semi-Rural		Urban

Item #7: Using behavioral objectives in planning

	Principals	Teachers	Coordinators
Highly needed			
Needed	Both		
Some need	Urban		
Little needed	Urban	Both	Both

Item #8: Translating student needs into goals and objectives

	Principals	Teachers	Coordinators
Highly needed			
Needed	Semi-Rural		
Some need	Urban		Semi-Rural
Little needed		Both	Urban

Item #9: Humanizing the vocational education classroom

	Principals	Teachers	Coordinators
Highly needed			
Needed			
Some need	Urban		Semi-Rural
Little needed	Both	Both	Urban

Item #10: Interpersonal communications

	Principals	Teachers	Coordinators
Highly needed			
Needed			Semi-Rural
Some need	Urban		
Little needed	Semi-Rural	Both	Urban

Item #11: Tests and measurement techniques

	Principals	Teachers	Coordinators
Highly needed			
Needed	Semi-Rural		
Some need	Urban		Both
Little needed		Both	Urban

Item #12: Monitoring student progress

	Principals	Teachers	Coordinators
Highly needed			
Needed	Both		Semi-Rural
Some need	Urban		Semi-Rural
Little needed		Both	Urban

Item #13: Grading and reporting

	Principals	Teachers	Coordinators
Highly needed			
Needed	Urban		
Some need			Semi-Rural
Little needed	Both	Both	Both

Item #14: Questioning techniques

	Principals	Teachers	Coordinators
Highly needed			
Needed	Urban	Semi-Rural	
Some need			Semi-Rural
Little needed	Semi-Rural	Urban	Urban

Item #15: Individualized instruction

	Principals	Teachers	Coordinators
Highly needed	Urban	Semi-Rural	
Needed	Both		
Some need			Semi-Rural
Little needed	Both	Both	Urban

Item #16: Teacher-student relations

	Principals	Teachers	Coordinators
Highly needed	Semi-Rural		
Needed	Urban		
Some need			Semi-Rural
Little needed	Semi-Rural	Both	Urban

Item #17: Use of audio-visual materials

	Principals	Teachers	Coordinators
Highly needed			
Needed	Semi-Rural		Semi-Rural
Some need			
Little needed	Urban	Both	Urban

Item #18: Teacher-made instructional materials

	Principals	Teachers	Coordinators
Highly needed			
Needed	Semi-Rural		Semi-Rural
Some need			
Little needed	Both	Both	Both

Item #19: Computer-assisted instruction

	Principals	Teachers	Coordinators
Highly needed			Semi-Rural
Needed	Both		Semi-Rural
Some need			Semi-Rural
Little needed	Urban	Both	Both

Item #20: Program articulation and coordination

	Principals	Teachers	Coordinators
Highly needed			
Needed	Semi-Rural	Semi-Rural	Both
Some need	Urban		
Little needed		Urban	

Item #21: Peer tutoring

	Principals	Teachers	Coordinators
Highly needed			
Needed			Semi-Rural
Some need	Semi-Rural	Semi-Rural	
Little needed	Urban	Urban	Urban

Item #22: Parent-teacher conferences

	Principals	Teachers	Coordinators
Highly needed			
Needed			
Some need			
Little needed	Both	Both	Both

Item #23: Record keeping

	Principals	Teachers	Coordinators
Highly needed			
Needed			
Some need			Semi-Rural
Little needed	Both	Both	Urban

Item #24: Utilization of educational television

	Principals	Teachers	Coordinators
Highly needed	Semi-Rural		
Needed			
Some need			Semi-Rural
Little needed	Both	Both	Urban

Item #25: Improving pupil achievement motivation

	Principals	Teachers	Coordinators
Highly needed	Semi-Rural	Semi-Rural	Urban
Needed	Both	Urban	Both
Some need			
Little needed			

Item #26: Utilization of paraprofessionals

	Principals	Teachers	Coordinators
Highly needed			Urban
Needed	Both	Urban	Both
Some need	Urban		Urban
Little needed		Semi-Rural	

Item #27: Techniques for dealing with cultural differences

	Principals	Teachers	Coordinators
Highly needed	Semi-Rural		Semi-Rural
Needed	Semi-Rural	Urban	
Some need	Urban		
Little needed	Semi-Rural	Semi-Rural	Urban

Item #28: Providing for students with limited academic development

	Principals	Teachers	Coordinators
Highly needed	Semi-Rural	Semi-Rural	Both
Needed	Urban	Urban	
Some need	Semi-Rural		
Little needed			

LIST 4: Level of Need Reported
by
Principals, Teachers, and Coordinators
from
Rural and Semi-Rural Districts

Item #1: Guidance and counseling techniques

	Principals	Teachers	Coordinators
Highly needed	Rural		Semi-Rural
Needed	Semi-Rural		Semi-Rural
Some need	Rural	Rural	Rural
Little needed	Rural	Semi-Rural	

Item #2: Effective utilization of resources

	Principals	Teachers	Coordinators
Highly needed	Semi-Rural		
Needed	Semi-Rural	Semi-Rural	
Some need	Rural	Rural	Both
Little needed			

Item #3: Vocational education for disadvantaged students

	Principals	Teachers	Coordinators
Highly needed	Semi-Rural		Rural
Needed	Rural	Rural	Rural
Some need		Both	Both
Little needed		Rural	

Item #4: Elimination of sex bias

	Principals	Teachers	Coordinators
Highly needed			Rural
Needed			Rural
Some need	Semi-Rural		
Little needed	Both	Both	Semi-Rural

Item #5: Vocational education in emerging occupations

	Principals	Teachers	Coordinators
Highly needed	Rural	Both	Semi-Rural
Needed	Semi-Rural		Semi-Rural
Some need	Rural		Both
Little needed			Semi-Rural

Item #6: Vocational education for handicapped students

	Principals	Teachers	Coordinators
Highly needed		Semi-Rural	Both
Needed	Rural		Rural
Some need		Rural	Rural
Little needed	Both		

Item #7: Using behavioral objectives in planning

	Principals	Teachers	Coordinators
Highly needed			
Needed	Semi-Rural		Rural
Some need	Rural		
Little needed		Both	Semi-Rural

Item #8: Translating student needs into goals and objectives

	Principals	Teachers	Coordinators
Highly needed			
Needed	Both	Rural	
Some need	Rural		Both
Little needed	Rural	Semi-Rural	

Item #9: Humanizing the vocational education classroom

	Principals	Teachers	Coordinators
Highly needed			Rural
Needed	Rural	Rural	
Some need		Rural	Both
Little needed	Semi-Rural	Semi-Rural	Rural

Item #10: Interpersonal communications

	Principals	Teachers	Coordinators
Highly needed			
Needed			Both
Some need			Rural
Little needed	Both	Both	Rural

Item #11: Tests and measurement techniques

	Principals	Teachers	Coordinators
Highly needed			Rural
Needed	Both		
Some need	Rural	Rural	Both
Little needed	Rural	Semi-Rural	Rural

Item #12: Monitoring student progress

	Principals	Teachers	Coordinators
Highly needed			Rural
Needed	Semi-Rural		Semi-Rural
Some need		Rural	Both
Little needed	Rural	Semi-Rural	Rural

Item #13: Grading and reporting

	Principals	Teachers	Coordinators
Highly needed			Rural
Needed			
Some need		Rural	Both
Little needed	Both	Semi-Rural	Both

Item #14: Questioning techniques

	Principals	Teachers	Coordinators
Highly needed			
Needed		Semi-Rural	Rural
Some need		Rural	Semi-Rural
Little needed	Both		

Item #15: Individualized instruction

	Principals	Teachers	Coordinators
Highly needed		Semi-Rural	
Needed	Semi-Rural		Rural
Some need	Rural	Rural	Semi-Rural
Little needed	Semi-Rural	Semi-Rural	

Item #16: Teacher-student relations

	Principals	Teachers	Coordinators
Highly needed	Semi-Rural		
Needed			Rural
Some need			Both
Little needed	Both	Both	Rural

Item #17: Use of audio-visual materials

	Principals	Teachers	Coordinators
Highly needed			
Needed	Semi-Rural		Both
Some need			
Little needed	Rural	Both	

Item #18: Teacher-made instructional materials

	Principals	Teachers	Coordinators
Highly needed			Rural
Needed	Semi-Rural		Both
Some need			
Little needed	Both	Both	Both

Item #19: Computer-assisted instruction

	Principals	Teachers	Coordinators
Highly needed			Both
Needed	Semi-Rural		Both
Some need			Semi-Rural
Little needed	Rural	Both	Both

Item #20: Program articulation and coordination

	Principals	Teachers	Coordinators
Highly needed			
Needed	Semi-Rural	Semi-Rural	Semi-Rural
Some need		Rural	Rural
Little needed	Rural		

Item #21: Peer tutoring

	Principals	Teachers	Coordinators
Highly needed			
Needed			Semi-Rural
Some need	Both	Both	Rural
Little needed	Rural		

Item #22: Parent-teacher conferences

	Principals	Teachers	Coordinators
Highly needed			
Needed			
Some need			Rural
Little needed	Both	Both	Semi-Rural

Item #23: Record keeping

	Principals	Teachers	Coordinators
Highly needed			
Needed			Rural
Some need			Both
Little needed	Both	Both	Rural

Item #24: Utilization of educational television

	Principals	Teachers	Coordinators
Highly needed	Semi-Rural		
Needed			Rural
Some need	Rural		Semi-Rural
Little needed	Both	Both	

Item #25: Improving pupil achievement motivation

	Principals	Teachers	Coordinators
Highly needed	Semi-Rural	Semi-Rural	
Needed	Both	Rural	Semi-Rural
Some need	Rural		Rural
Little needed	Rural		

Item #26: Utilization of paraprofessionals

	Principals	Teachers	Coordinators
Highly needed			
Needed	Semi-Rural		Semi-Rural
Some need	Rural	Rural	Rural
Little needed		Both	

Item #27: Techniques for dealing with cultural differences

	Principals	Teachers	Coordinators
Highly needed	Semi-Rural		Semi-Rural
Needed	Semi-Rural		Rural
Some need		Rural	
Little needed	Both	Semi-Rural	

Item #28: Providing for students with limited academic development

	Principals	Teachers	Coordinators
Highly needed	Semi-Rural	Semi-Rural	Both
Needed			Rural
Some need	Semi-Rural	Rural	Rural
Little needed	Rural		

Section I, Needs: High/Low, Urban, Rural, and Semi-Rural Districts

Table 3, which follows, clarifies which inservice training need items were rated as high (either "highly needed" or "needed") and which were rated as low ("some need" or "little needed") by principals, teachers, and coordinators from rural, urban, and semi-rural districts. The items listed in Table 3 can be found in Appendix A.

TABLE 3: Inservice Training Needs Rated as High and Low
by
Principals, Teachers, and Coordinators
from
Urban, Rural, and Semi-Rural Districts

Items Rated as High

Urban Principals			3		5	6								14	15	16										25			28
Rural Principals			3		5	6			9																				28
Semi-Rural Principals	1	2	3		5		7	8			11	12			15	16	17	18	19	20			24	25	26	27	28		
Urban Teachers		2			5																					25			28
Rural Teachers					5			8																		25			
Semi-Rural Teachers		2	3		5	6									15					20						25			28
Urban Coordinators		2			5										15					20						25	26		28
Rural Coordinators			3	4		6	7							14	15		17	18	19				24				27	28	
Semi-Rural Coordinators	1		3		5	6				10		12					17		19	20	21				25	26	27	28	

Items Rated as Low

Urban Principals	1	2		4			7	8	9	10	11	12	13				17	18	19	20	21	22	23	24		26	27		
Rural Principals	1	2		4	5	6	7	8		10	11	12	13	14	15	16	17	18	19	20	21	22	23	24	25	26	27	28	
Semi-Rural Principals				4		6	7		9	10	11	12	13	14	15	16		18			21	22	23	24				28	
Urban Teachers	1		3	4		6	7	8	9	10	11	12	13	14	15	16	17	18	19	20	21	22	23	24		26	27		
Rural Teachers	1	2	3	4		6	7		9	10	11	12	13	14	15	16	17	18	19	20	21	22	23	24		26	27	28	
Semi-Rural Teachers	1			4			7	8	9	10	11	12	13	14	15	16	17	18	19		21	22	23	24		26	27		
Urban Coordinators	1		3	4		6	7	8	9	10	11	12	13	14		16	17	18	19		21	22	23	24			27		
Rural Coordinators	1	2			5			8	9	10	11	12	13			16				20	21	22	23		25	26			
Semi-Rural Coordinators		2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9	10	11	12	13	14	15	16	17	18	19		21	22	23	24					

Section I, Needs: Ranked from Highest to Lowest, Urban, Rural, and Semi-Rural Districts

Tables 4, 5, and 6, following, show the order in which the 28 inservice training need items were ranked from highest (those which the most respondents rated as of high need) to lowest (those which the most respondents rated as having a low need). Table 4 compares the rankings of urban principals, rural principals, and semi-rural principals. Table 5 shows the rankings of teachers from each of the three areas. The rankings of urban coordinators, rural coordinators, and semi-rural coordinators can be found in Table 6. The items listed in these tables can be found in Appendix A.

TABLE 4: Comparison of Need Items
Ranked from Highest to Lowest
by
Urban, Rural, and Semi-Rural Principals

Rank	Urban Principals	Rural Principals	Semi-Rural Principals
1	5,28	3,9	19,25
2	6,14	5,6,28	5,26
3	3,15,16,25	1,8,11,19,24,25,26,27	1,2,3,8,17,20,27
4	2,7,8,12,13,20,26,27	2,7,10,12,13,14,16,18,20,22,23	7,11,12,15,16,18,24,28
5	1,10,18,19	4,15,17,21	7,11,12,15,16,18,21,24,28
6	4,9,11,21,22,23,24		6,9,10,22,23
7	17		13,14
8			4

TABLE 5: Comparison of Need Items
Ranked from Highest to Lowest
by
Urban, Rural, and Semi-Rural Teachers

Rank	Urban Teachers	Rural Teachers	Semi-Rural Teachers
1	5	5	5
2	25	25	25
3	28	8	28
4	2	28	3
5	26	1	2,6,20
6	18	3,19	15
7	19	9,11,15,18	1
8	27	12,26,27	26
9	6	6	8,11,27
10	15	2,24	14,18
11	1	7,14,17,20,22	12,19
12	3,8,11	23	24
13	17	10	10
14	14	16	9
15	12	13,21	17
16	9,20	4	21
17	7,10,13,21		13
18	16		16,23
19	24		7
20	4,23		4,22
21	22		

TABLE 6: Comparison of Need Items
Ranked from Highest to Lowest
by
Urban, Rural, and Semi-Rural Coordinators

Rank	Urban Coordinators	Rural Coordinators	Semi-Rural Coordinators
1	5	27	25
2	25	3,4,6,7,14,15,17,18,19,24,28	1
3	20	1,2,5,8,9,10,11,12,13,16,21,22,23,26	20,26,27,28
4	2,15,26,28	20,25	3,5,6,10,12,17,19,21
5	1,3,16,19,23		9,11,15,16,18,24
6	6,18,21,24,27		2,8,13,22
7	8,11,12,14		4,14,23
8	9,10,22		7
9	13,17		
10	4,7		

Section II, Methods: All Districts

Section I of the survey dealt with various needs that educators might have for inservice training in different areas. Section II describes several methods of inservice training, and asks respondents to rate their preferences for those methods. List 5 answers the question: "What level of preference for various methods of inservice training is assigned to each of those items by a majority of principals, teachers, and coordinators from all districts?" As with the lists found previously, the position of each named respondent group shows the level of preference reported by the majority of persons from that group who answered the item.

LIST 5: Level of Preference Reported
by
Principals, Teachers, and Coordinators
from
All Districts

Item #1: Lecture

Most preferred			
Preferred			
Little preferred			
Least preferred	Principals	Teachers	Coordinators

Item #2: Individual consultation

Most preferred			
Preferred	Principals	Teachers	Coordinators
Little preferred			
Least preferred			

Item #3: Small group discussion

Most preferred			
Preferred	Principals	Teachers	Coordinators
Little preferred			
Least preferred			

Item #4: Demonstration of materials or methods

Most preferred	Principals	Teachers	Coordinators
Preferred	Principals		
Little preferred			
Least preferred			

Item #5: Role playing

Most preferred			
Preferred			
Little preferred			
Least preferred	Principals	Teachers	Coordinators

Item #6: Audio-visual presentations

Most preferred			
Preferred	Principals	Teachers	Coordinators
Little preferred			
Least preferred			

Item #7: Independent study

	Principals	Teachers	Coordinators
Most preferred			
Preferred			
Little preferred			Coordinators
Least preferred			Coordinators

Section II, Methods: Preferred/Not Preferred, All Districts

Table 7, which follows, shows which vocational education inservice training methods were rated as high and which were rated as low by a majority of principals, teachers, and coordinators from all districts. The methods given as high are those which the majority of respondents in each group rated as either "most preferred" or "preferred". The methods shown as low were rated as either "little preferred" or "least preferred". The item numbers listed in Table 7 can be found in Appendix A.

TABLE 7: Training Methods Rated as Preferred and Not Preferred
by
Principals, Teachers, and Coordinators
from
All Districts

	Items Rated as Preferred
Principals	2 3 4 6
Teachers	2 3 4 6
Coordinators	2 3 4 6

	Items Rated as Not Preferred
Principals	1 5 7
Teachers	1 5 7
Coordinators	1 5 7

Section II, Methods: Ranked from Highest to Lowest, All Districts

Table 8, which follows, indicates the ranking of the seven methods of inservice training, from highest to lowest, based upon the majority responses from principals, teachers, and coordinators from all districts. Items whose numbers are printed in the table are listed in Appendix A.

TABLE 8: Comparison of Training Methods
Ranked from Highest to Lowest
by
Principals, Teachers, and Coordinators
from
All Districts

Rank	Principals	Teachers	Coordinators
1	2	4	4
2	3	3	3
3	4	6	6
4	6	2	2
5	5,7	7	5,7
6	1	1	1
7		5	

Section II, Methods: Comparisons Between Districts

The following lists give information on the responses of educators from urban, rural, and semi-rural school districts. List 6 compares the preferences for methods of inservice training of educators from rural and urban school districts. List 7 compares the responses of principals, teachers, and coordinators from urban and semi-rural districts, and List 8 compares the preferences of rural and semi-rural educators on those same items.

LIST 6: Level of Preference Reported
by
Principals, Teachers, and Coordinators
from
Rural and Urban Districts

Item #1: Lecture

	Principals	Teachers	Coordinators
Most preferred			
Preferred			
Little preferred		Rural	Urban
Least preferred	Both	Urban	Rural

Item #2: Individual consultation

	Principals	Teachers	Coordinators
Most preferred			Rural
Preferred	Both	Both	Both
Little preferred			Rural
Least preferred			

Item #3: Small group discussion

	Principals	Teachers	Coordinators
Most preferred	Urban		
Preferred	Rural	Both	Urban
Little preferred			Rural
Least preferred			

Item #4: Demonstration of materials or methods

	Principals	Teachers	Coordinators
Most preferred	Urban	Both	Both
Preferred	Both		
Little preferred			
Least preferred			

Item #5: Role playing

	Principals	Teachers	Coordinators
Most preferred			Rural
Preferred			Rural
Little preferred			
Least preferred	Both	Both	Both

Item #6: Audio-visual presentations

	Principals	Teachers	Coordinators
Most preferred			Urban
Preferred	Both	Both	
Little preferred	Urban		Rural
Least preferred			

Item #7: Independent study

	Principals	Teachers	Coordinators
Most preferred			
Preferred		Rural	
Little preferred	Urban		
Least preferred	Rural	Urban	Both

LIST 7: Level of Preference Reported
by
Principals, Teachers, and Coordinators
from
Urban and Semi-Rural Districts

Item #1: Lecture

	Principals	Teachers	Coordinators
Most preferred			
Preferred			
Little preferred		Semi-Rural	Urban
Least preferred	Both	Urban	Semi-Rural

Item #2: Individual consultation

	Principals	Teachers	Coordinators
Most preferred	Semi-Rural		
Preferred	Both	Both	Urban
Little preferred			Semi-Rural
Least preferred			

Item #3: Small group discussion

	Principals	Teachers	Coordinators
Most preferred	Urban		
Preferred	Semi-Rural	Both	Both
Little preferred			
Least preferred			

Item #4: Demonstration of materials or methods

	Principals	Teachers	Coordinators
Most preferred	Both	Both	Both
Preferred	Urban		
Little preferred			
Least preferred			

Item #5: Role playing

	Principals	Teachers	Coordinators
Most preferred			
Preferred			
Little preferred			
Least preferred	Both	Both	Both

Item #6: Audio-visual presentations

	Principals	Teachers	Coordinators
Most preferred			Urban
Preferred	Both	Both	Semi-Rural
Little preferred	Urban		
Least preferred			

Item #7: Independent study

	Principals	Teachers	Coordinators
Most preferred			
Preferred		Semi-Rural	
Little preferred	Urban		Semi-Rural
Least preferred	Semi-Rural	Urban	Urban

LIST 8: Level of Preference Reported
by
Principals, Teachers, and Coordinators
from
Rural and Semi-Rural Districts

Item #1: Lecture

	Principals	Teachers	Coordinators
Most preferred			
Preferred			
Little preferred		Both	
Least preferred	Both		Both

Item #2: Individual consultation

	Principals	Teachers	Coordinators
Most preferred	Semi-Rural		Rural
Preferred	Both	Both	Rural
Little preferred			Both
Least preferred			

Item #3: Small group discussion

	Principals	Teachers	Coordinators
Most preferred			
Preferred	Both	Both	Semi-Rural
Little preferred			Rural
Least preferred			

Item #4: Demonstration of materials or methods

	Principals	Teachers	Coordinators
Most preferred	Semi-Rural	Both	Both
Preferred	Rural		
Little preferred			
Least preferred			

Item #5: Role playing

	Principals	Teachers	Coordinators
Most preferred			Rural
Preferred			Rural
Little preferred			
Least preferred	Both	Both	Both

Item #6: Audio-visual presentations

	Principals	Teachers	Coordinators
Most preferred			
Preferred	Both	Both	Semi-Rural
Little preferred			Rural
Least preferred			

Item #7: Independent study

	Principals	Teachers	Coordinators
Most preferred			
Preferred		Both	
Little preferred			Semi-Rural
Least preferred	Both		Rural

Section II, Methods: Preferred/Not Preferred, Rural, Urban, and Semi-Rural Districts

Table 9, following, clarifies which methods of inservice training were rated as high (either "most preferred" or "preferred") and which were rated as low ("little preferred" or "least preferred") by principals, teachers, and coordinators from rural, urban, and semi-rural districts. The item numbers listed in Table 9 can be found in Appendix A.

TABLE 9: Training Methods Rated as Preferred and Not Preferred
by
Principals, Teachers, and Coordinators
from
Urban, Rural, and Semi-Rural Districts

Items Rated as Preferred

Urban Principals		2	3	4		6	
Rural Principals		2	3	4		6	
Semi-Rural Principals		2	3	4		6	
Urban Teachers			3	4		6	
Rural Teachers		2	3	4		6	7
Semi-Rural Teachers		2	3	4		6	
Urban Coordinators		2	3	4		6	
Rural Coordinators		2		4	5		
Semi-Rural Coordinators			3	4		6	

Items Rated as Not Preferred

Urban Principals	1				5	6	7
Rural Principals	1				5		7
Semi-Rural Principals	1				5		7
Urban Teachers	1	2			5		7
Rural Teachers	1				5		
Semi-Rural Teachers	1				5		7
Urban Coordinators	1				5		7
Rural Coordinators	1		3			6	7
Semi-Rural Coordinators	1	2			5		7

Section II, Methods: Ranked from Highest to Lowest, Urban, Rural, and Semi-Rural Districts

Tables 10, 11, and 12, which follow, show the order in which the seven methods of inservice training were ranked from highest (those which the most respondents rated as of high preference) to lowest (those which the most respondents rated as having low preference). Table 10 compares the rankings of urban principals, rural principals, and semi-rural principals. Table 11 shows the rankings of teachers from each of the three areas. The rankings of urban coordinators, rural coordinators, and semi-rural coordinators can be found in Table 12. The items for which item numbers are listed in these tables can be found in Appendix A.

TABLE 10: Comparison of Training Methods
Ranked from Highest to Lowest
by
Urban, Rural, and Semi-Rural Principals

Rank	Urban Principals	Rural Principals	Semi-Rural Principals
1	2	2,3,4,6	3,4,6
2	3	5	2
3	4	7	5,7
4	6	1	1
5	7		
6	1,5		
7			

TABLE 11: Comparison of Training Methods
Ranked from Highest to Lowest
by
Urban, Rural, and Semi-Rural Teachers

Rank	Urban Teachers	Rural Teachers	Semi-Rural Teachers
1	4	4	4
2	3	6	3
3	6	3	6
4	2	2	2
5	7	7	7
6	1	1	1
7	5	5	5

TABLE 12: Comparison of Training Methods
Ranked from Highest to Lowest
by
Urban, Rural, and Semi-Rural Coordinators

Rank	Urban Coordinators	Rural Coordinators	Semi-Rural Coordinators
1	4	2,4,5	3
2	3	3	4,6
3	6	1,6,7	2,5
4	2		7
5	1,7		1
6	5		

Section III, Characteristics: All Districts

Section III of the survey describes several characteristics of inservice training. Respondents were asked to rate the importance of each of these characteristics. List 9 answers the question: "What level of importance is assigned to each of the characteristics of inservice training by a majority of principals, teachers, and coordinators from all districts?" As with the lists found previously, the position of each named respondent group shows the level of importance reported by the majority of persons from that group.

LIST 9: Level of Importance Reported
by
Principals, Teachers, and Coordinators
from
All Districts

Item #1: Based on specific objectives

Very important	Principals	Teachers	Coordinators
Important	Principals		
Some importance			
Not important			

Item #2: Teachers should determine content

Very important		Teachers	
Important	Principals		Coordinators
Some importance			
Not important			

Item #3: Inservice training to include both teachers and administrators

Very important		Teachers	
Important	Principals		Coordinators
Some importance			
Not important			

Item #4: Principals should provide leadership in planning

Very important			
Important	Principals	Teachers	Coordinators
Some importance			
Not important			

Item #5: Inservice training should improve classroom performance

Very important	Principals	Teachers	Coordinators
Important			
Some importance			
Not important			

Item #6: Inservice training should acquaint teachers with new innovations

Very important	Principals	Teachers	Coordinators
Important			
Some importance			
Not important			

Item #7: Inservice training should be conducted by selected teachers

Very important			
Important		Teachers	Coordinators
Some importance	Principals		
Not important			

Item #8: District financial support should be high priority

Very important		Teachers	Coordinators
Important	Principals		
Some importance			
Not important			

Item #9: Teachers should be trained in interpersonal relations

Very important			
Important	Principals	Teachers	Coordinators
Some importance			
Not important			

Item #10: All teachers should be involved in on-going inservice training

Very important		Teachers	Coordinators
Important	Principals		
Some importance			
Not important			

Item #11: Inservice training should focus on few topics rather than mixture

Very important	Principals		
Important		Teachers	Coordinators
Some importance			
Not important			

Section III, Characteristics: Important/Not Important, All Districts

Table 13, following, shows which vocational education inservice training characteristics were rated as high and which were rated as low by a majority of principals, teachers, and coordinators from all districts. The characteristics given as high are those which the majority of respondents in each group rated either "very important" or "important". The characteristics shown as low were rated as either of "some importance" or "not important". The items for the item numbers listed in Table 13 can be found in Appendix A.

TABLE 13: Training Characteristics Rated as Important and Not Important by Principals, Teachers, and Coordinators from All Districts

Items Rated as Important

Principals	1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11
Teachers	1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11
Coordinators	1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11

Items Rated as Not Important

Principals Teachers Coordinators	all items were rated as important

Section III, Characteristics: Ranked from Highest to Lowest, All Districts

Table 14, following, indicates the ranking of the eleven characteristics of inservice training, from highest to lowest, based upon the majority responses from principals, teachers, and coordinators from all districts. Items whose numbers are printed in the table are listed in Appendix A.

TABLE 14: Comparison of Training Characteristics
Ranked from Highest to Lowest
by
Principals, Teachers, and Coordinators
from
All Districts

Rank	Principals	Teachers	Coordinators
1	5,6	6	1
2	1	5	5,6
3	4,9,10,11	1	2
4	8	2	4,8,11
5	3	8	3
6	2,7	10	9,10
7		3	7
8		11	
9		4	
10		7	
11		9	

Section III, Characteristics: Comparisons Between Districts

The following lists give information on the responses of educators from urban, rural, and semi-rural school districts. List 10 compares the importance assigned to the eleven characteristics of inservice training by educators from rural and urban school districts. List 11 compares the responses of principals, teachers, and coordinators from urban and semi-rural districts, and List 12 compares the importance educators from rural and semi-rural districts placed on the various characteristics.

LIST 10: Level of Importance Reported
by
Principals, Teachers, and Coordinators
from
Rural and Urban Districts

Item #1: Based on specific objectives

	Principals	Teachers	Coordinators
Very important	Urban	Both	Rural
Important	Rural		Urban
Some importance			
Not important			

Item #2: Teachers should determine content

	Principals	Teachers	Coordinators
Very important		Urban	
Important	Urban	Rural	Both
Some importance	Rural		
Not important			

Item #3: Inservice training to include both teachers and administrators

	Principals	Teachers	Coordinators
Very important	Urban	Both	Rural
Important	Both		Both
Some importance			
Not important			Rural

Item #4: Principals should provide leadership in planning

	Principals	Teachers	Coordinators
Very important			Rural
Important	Both	Both	Both
Some importance			
Not important			Rural

Item #5: Inservice training should improve classroom performance

	Principals	Teachers	Coordinators
Very important	Both	Both	Both
Important			
Some importance			
Not important			

Item #6: Inservice training should acquaint teachers with new innovations

	Principals	Teachers	Coordinators
Very important	Both	Both	Both
Important	Rural		Rural
Some importance			
Not important			Rural

Item #7: Inservice training should be conducted by selected teachers

	Principals	Teachers	Coordinators
Very important			Urban
Important	Urban	Both	Both
Some importance	Rural		Rural
Not important			Rural

Item #8: District financial support should be high priority

	Principals	Teachers	Coordinators
Very important		Rural	
Important	Both	Urban	Both
Some importance			Rural
Not important			Rural

Item #9: Teachers should be trained in interpersonal relations

	Principals	Teachers	Coordinators
Very important			Rural
Important	Both	Both	Both
Some importance			
Not important			Rural

Item #10: All teachers should be involved in on-going inservice training

	Principals	Teachers	Coordinators
Very important		Both	Rural
Important	Both		Both
Some importance			Urban
Not important			Rural

Item #11: Inservice training should focus on few topics rather than mixture

	Principals	Teachers	Coordinators
Very important	Urban	Rural	Rural
Important	Both	Urban	Urban
Some importance			
Not important			

LIST 11: Level of Importance Reported
by
Principals, Teachers, and Coordinators
from
Urban and Semi-Rural Districts

Item #1: Based on specific objectives

	Principals	Teachers	Coordinators
Very important	Both	Both	Semi-Rural
Important			Urban
Some importance			
Not important			

Item #2: Teachers should determine content

	Principals	Teachers	Coordinators
Very important		Both	
Important	Both		Both
Some importance	Semi-Rural		
Not important			

Item #3: Inservice training to include both teachers and administrators

	Principals	Teachers	Coordinators
Very important	Urban	Both	
Important	Both		Both
Some importance			
Not important			

Item #4: Principals should provide leadership in planning

	Principals	Teachers	Coordinators
Very important		Semi-Rural	Semi-Rural
Important	Both	Urban	Urban
Some importance			
Not important			

Item #5: Inservice training should improve classroom performance

	Principals	Teachers	Coordinators
Very important	Both	Both	Both
Important			
Some importance			
Not important			

Item #6: Inservice training should acquaint teachers with new innovations

	Principals	Teachers	Coordinators
Very important	Both	Both	Both
Important			
Some importance			
Not important			

Item #7: Inservice training should be conducted by selected teachers

	Principals	Teachers	Coordinators
Very important		Semi-Rural	Urban
Important	Both	Both	Both
Some importance	Semi-Rural		
Not important			

Item #8: District financial support should be high priority

	Principals	Teachers	Coordinators
Very important	Semi-Rural	Semi-Rural	Semi-Rural
Important	Both	Urban	Urban
Some importance			
Not important			

Item #9: Teachers should be trained in interpersonal relations

	Principals	Teachers	Coordinators
Very important	Semi-Rural		
Important	Both	Both	Both
Some importance			
Not important			

Item #10: All teachers should be involved in on-going inservice training

	Principals	Teachers	Coordinators
Very important	Semi-Rural	Both	Semi-Rural
Important	Both		Urban
Some importance			Urban
Not important			

Item #11: Inservice training should focus on few topics rather than mixture

	Principals	Teachers	Coordinators
Very important	Both		
Important	Urban	Both	Both
Some importance			
Not important			

LIST 12: Level of Importance Reported
by
Principals, Teachers, and Coordinators
from
Rural and Semi-Rural Districts

Item #1: Based on specific objectives

	Principals	Teachers	Coordinators
Very important	Semi-Rural	Both	Both
Important	Rural		
Some importance			
Not important			

Item #2: Teachers should determine content

	Principals	Teachers	Coordinators
Very important		Semi-Rural	
Important	Semi-Rural	Rural	Both
Some importance	Both		
Not important			

Item #3: Inservice training to include both teachers and administrators

	Principals	Teachers	Coordinators
Very important		Both	Rural
Important	Both		Both
Some importance			
Not important			Rural

Item #4: Principals should provide leadership in planning

	Principals	Teachers	Coordinators
Very important		Semi-Rural	Both
Important	Both	Rural	Rural
Some importance			
Not important			Rural

Item #5: Inservice training should improve classroom performance

	Principals	Teachers	Coordinators
Very important	Both	Both	Both
Important			
Some importance			
Not important			

Item #6: Inservice training should acquaint teachers with new innovations

	Principals	Teachers	Coordinators
Very important	Both	Both	Both
Important	Rural		Rural
Some importance			
Not important			Rural

Item #7: Inservice training should be conducted by selected teachers

	Principals	Teachers	Coordinators
Very important		Semi-Rural	
Important	Semi-Rural	Both	Both
Some importance	Both		Rural
Not important			Rural

Item #8: District financial support should be high priority

	Principals	Teachers	Coordinators
Very important	Semi-Rural	Both	Semi-Rural
Important	Both		Rural
Some importance			Rural
Not important			Rural

Item #9: Teachers should be trained in interpersonal relations

	Principals	Teachers	Coordinators
Very important	Semi-Rural		Rural
Important	Both	Both	Both
Some importance			
Not important			Rural

Item #10: All teachers should be involved in on-going inservice training

	Principals	Teachers	Coordinators
Very important	Semi-Rural	Both	Both
Important	Both		Rural
Some importance			
Not important			Rural

Item #11: Inservice training should focus on few topics rather than mixture

	Principals	Teachers	Coordinators
Very important	Semi-Rural	Rural	Rural
Important	Rural	Semi-Rural	Semi-Rural
Some importance			
Not important			

Section III, Characteristics: Important/Not Important, Urban, Rural and Semi-Rural Districts

Table 15, which follows, clarifies which characteristics of inservice training were rated as high (either "very important" or "important") and which were rated as low ("some importance" or "not important") by principals, teachers, and coordinators from rural, urban, and semi-rural districts. The items whose item numbers are listed in Table 15 can be found in Appendix A.

TABLE 15: Training Characteristics Rated as Important and Not Important by Principals, Teachers, and Coordinators from Urban, Rural, and Semi-Rural Districts

Items Rated as Important

Urban Principals	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9	10	11
Rural Principals	1		3	4	5	6		8	9	10	11
Semi-Rural Principals	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9	10	11
Urban Teachers	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9	10	11
Rural Teachers	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9	10	11
Semi-Rural Teachers	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9	10	11
Urban Coordinators	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9	10	11
Rural Coordinators	1	2	3	4	5	6			9	10	11
Semi-Rural Coordinators	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9	10	11

Items Rated as Not Important

Urban Principals		
Rural Principals	2	7
Semi-Rural Principals	2	7
Urban Teachers		
Rural Teachers		
Semi-Rural Teachers		
Urban Coordinators		
Rural Coordinators		7 8
Semi-Rural Coordinators		

Section III, Characteristics: Ranked from Highest to Lowest, Urban, Rural, and Semi-Rural Districts

Tables 16, 17, and 18, which follow, show the order in which the eleven characteristics of inservice training were ranked from highest (those which the most respondents rated as of high importance) to lowest (those which the most respondents rated as having low importance). Table 16 compares the rankings of urban principals, rural principals, and semi-rural principals. Table 17 shows the rankings of teachers from each of the three areas. The rankings of urban coordinators, rural coordinators, and semi-rural coordinators can be found in Table 18. The items for which item numbers are listed in these tables can be found in Appendix A.

TABLE 16: Comparison of Training Characteristics
Ranked from Highest to Lowest
by
Urban, Rural, and Semi-Rural Principals

Rank	Urban Principals	Rural Principals	Semi-Rural Principals
1	1,5,6,10	5,6	1,5,6,9
2	4,8,11	1,3,4,8,9,10,11	3,4,11
3	2,7,9	2,7	8,10
4	3		2,7

TABLE 17: Comparison of Training Characteristics
Ranked from Highest to Lowest
by
Urban, Rural, and Semi-Rural Teachers

Rank	Urban Teachers	Rural Teachers	Semi-Rural Teachers
1	5,6	5	6
2	1	6	1
3	2	1	2,5
4	8	2,8	8
5	3,10	11	10
6	7	7	3
7	11	10	11
8	4	3,4	4
9	9	9	9
10			7

TABLE 18: Comparison of Training Characteristics
Ranked from Highest to Lowest
by
Urban, Rural, and Semi-Rural Coordinators

Rank	Urban Coordinators	Rural Coordinators	Semi-Rural Coordinators
1	1,2,6	1,2,3,4,5,6,9,10,11	1,5
2	4,5,8	7,8	6
3	11		2,3,10,11
4	3,7,9		4,7,8,9
5	10		

ANALYSIS OF THE DATA

The data in this report are summed to report the overall responses from principals, teachers, and coordinators from all districts. The data were then cross-tabulated and summed to permit a comparison of results from respondents grouped in three types of school districts. As previously explained, Anchorage and Fairbanks data were summed for this study and labeled "urban". The 21 Rural Education Attendance Areas' data were summed under "rural". The remaining borough and city school district data were summed under "semi-rural". Thus the data may be examined in the following ways:

1. Majority responses from All Districts
2. Comparisons of majority responses: Urban/Rural
3. Comparisons of majority responses: Urban/Semi-Rural
4. Comparisons of majority responses: Rural/Semi-Rural

Kinds of information to be obtained.

The report answers the following questions:

A. For each of 28 selected vocational education inservice training need items, what is the level of need reported by a majority of principals, teachers, and coordinators?

B. Which vocational education inservice training items were rated as high and which as low by this majority?

C. How were the items distributed from high to low as ranked by a majority of responses from principals, teachers, and coordinators?

D. What methods of delivery of vocational education inservice training are preferred by a majority of principals, teachers, and coordinators?

E. What characteristics of vocational education inservice training were felt to be most important by this majority?

Analysis

The reader is urged to draw his or her own conclusions from the data. The following analysis will be confined to observations of major aspects of the outcomes for all districts. No attempt will be made to draw conclusions regarding causal relationships.

Section I - Needs

Highest Valued Vocational Education Inservice Training Items.

Item 5, "Vocational Education in emerging occupations", was ranked highest by a majority of all principals and teachers. It was ranked second highest by coordinators.

Item 25, "Improving pupil motivation", was ranked highest by a majority of all coordinators and second-highest by teachers. Principals included three items in second rank, including item 25.

Item 28, "Providing for students with limited academic development", was ranked second by a majority of principals, and third by teachers and coordinators.

The reader should review page 13 to note the range of values for the remaining items. Below the first and second rankings, it is apparent that there is an increasing variety of value/item listings between the three groups of respondents (principals, teachers, and coordinators).

Lowest Valued Vocational Education Inservice Training Items.

Respondents approach agreement again at the lowest ranked items. Item 4, "Elimination of sex bias", was placed lowest in rank by a majority of all principals and all teachers and next to last by coordinators (they rated item 7, "Using behavioral objectives in planning", as lowest). Items 22, "Parent-teacher conferences", and

23, "Record keeping", were second from the lowest for principals. Teachers showed almost the same low ranking of values for these two items.

Highest and Lowest Items Compared Among Urban, Rural, and Semi-Rural Districts.

The reader is referred to page 33 for a comparison of highest to-lowest ranking of items by a majority of principals from urban, rural, and semi-rural districts. The same data for teachers are provided on page 34 and for coordinators on page 35.

The planner of personnel development services for vocational education should find these data useful in deciding the content of vocational education inservice training activities. Further insight may be gained by studying the individual items which earned the highest majority rankings. The responses of principals, teachers, and coordinators are reported on pages 5-9, 15-19, 20-24, and 25-29. The levels of need for each item are reported for all districts, rural and urban districts, urban and semi-rural districts, and rural and semi-rural districts, respectively.

Section II - Methods

Highest and Lowest Preference for Methods of Training.

A majority of teachers and coordinators ranked method 4, "Demonstration of materials or methods", as first. This method was ranked third by principals. All three groups ranked method 3, "Small group discussion", as second. Method 6, "Audio-visual presentations" was ranked third by teachers and coordinators and fourth by principals. Method 2, "Individual consultation", was ranked first by principals, and fourth by teachers and coordinators (page 42).

The lecture method (method 1 on the survey) was ranked lowest by principals and coordinators and next-to-lowest by teachers. They ranked method 5, "Role playing" as lowest.

Again the reader is advised to examine further tables and lists in the report for an item-by-item account and for comparison of rural/urban, urban/semi-rural, and rural/semi-rural data regarding the preference of particular methods of vocational education inservice training for these groups.

Section III - Characteristics

Highest and Lowest Importance of Characteristics of Training.

The majority of principals, teachers, and coordinators from all districts ranked these characteristics of vocational education inservice training as either first or second: 5, "Inservice training should improve classroom performance", 6, "Inservice training should acquaint teachers with new materials and innovations", and 1, "Inservice training should be based on specific objectives".

At the lowest end of the ranking, characteristic 7, "Inservice training should be conducted by selected teachers and administrators", was at the bottom for principals and coordinators. It was next-to-lowest for teachers. They rated characteristic 9, "Inservice training should train teachers in interpersonal relations in the classroom", as lowest (page 62).

As with Sections I and II, the Characteristics component of the report provides further tables and lists for an item-by-item account and for comparison of responses between rural, urban, and semi-rural groups.

CONCLUSION

This report, "Results of Vocational Education Inservice Training Needs Assessment Survey", has presented the majority responses of principals, teachers, and coordinators in tabular, listed, and narrative form. Section I reported levels of need for inservice training for 28 content items. Section II reported levels of preference for methods of inservice training for seven items. Section III reported respondent levels of importance for 11 characteristics of inservice training.

Responses were tabulated for 20 principals, 268 teachers, and 23 coordinators. Results were reported for four groupings of these respondents: (1) All Districts, (2) Rural/Urban Districts, (3) Urban/Semi-Rural Districts, and (4) Rural/Semi-Rural Districts.

Respondent data were sorted into "highest-and-lowest" dichotomies, ranked from "highest to lowest", and reported item-by-item. The reader is invited to examine the results in accordance with nis or her particular needs for obtaining a picture of overall outcomes and for making comparisons of respondent data among the various groups.

Appendix A

Survey Instrument

VOCATIONAL EDUCATION SURVEY 99

For each item below, my need for inservice training is...	(Circle one) Low-----High	(Check which apply) I've had training.	I'd like training
		#	
1. Guidance and counseling techniques for vocational education	1 2 3 4	☐ - 1-	☐
2. Effective utilization of school and community resources	1 2 3 4	☐ - 2-	☐
3. Vocational education for disadvantaged students	1 2 3 4	☐ - 3-	☐
4. Elimination of sex bias	1 2 3 4	☐ - 4-	☐
5. Vocational education in emerging occupations	1 2 3 4	☐ - 5-	☐
6. Vocational education for handicapped students	1 2 3 4	☐ - 6-	☐
7. Using behavioral objectives in planning	1 2 3 4	☐ - 7-	☐
8. Translating student needs into goals and objectives	1 2 3 4	☐ - 8-	☐
9. Humanizing the vocational education classroom	1 2 3 4	☐ - 9-	☐
10. Interpersonal communications	1 2 3 4	☐ -10-	☐
11. Tests and measurement techniques	1 2 3 4	☐ -11-	☐
12. Monitoring student progress	1 2 3 4	☐ -12-	☐
13. Grading and reporting	1 2 3 4	☐ -13-	☐
14. Questioning techniques	1 2 3 4	☐ -14-	☐
15. Individualized instruction	1 2 3 4	☐ -15-	☐
16. Teacher-student relations	1 2 3 4	☐ -16-	☐
17. Use of audio-visual materials in the classroom	1 2 3 4	☐ -17-	☐
18. Teacher-made instructional materials	1 2 3 4	☐ -18-	☐
19. Computer-assisted instruction	1 2 3 4	☐ -19-	☐
20. Program articulation and coordination	1 2 3 4	☐ -20-	☐
21. Peer tutoring	1 2 3 4	☐ -21-	☐
22. Parent-teacher conferences	1 2 3 4	☐ -22-	☐
23. Record keeping	1 2 3 4	☐ -23-	☐
24. Utilization of educational television	1 2 3 4	☐ -24-	☐
25. Improving pupil achievement motivation	1 2 3 4	☐ -25-	☐
26. Utilization of paraprofessionals	1 2 3 4	☐ -26-	☐
27. Techniques for dealing with cultural differences	1 2 3 4	☐ -27-	☐
28. Providing for students with limited academic development	1 2 3 4	☐ -28-	☐
29. My teaching area or subject _____	1 2 3 4	☐ -29-	☐
30. Other _____	1 2 3 4	☐ -30-	☐

For me, this method of inservice training is...	Least preferred-------Most preferred			
1. Lecture	1	2	3	4
2. Individual consultation	1	2	3	4
3. Small group discussion	1	2	3	4
4. Demonstration of materials or methods	1	2	3	4
5. Role playing	1	2	3	4
6. Audio-visual presentations (films, slides, videotapes, etc.)	1	2	3	4
7. Independent study	1	2	3	4

For me, this method of inservice training is...	Least preferred			Most preferred
1. Lecture	1	2	3	4
2. Individual consultation	1	2	3	4
3. Small group discussion	1	2	3	4
4. Demonstration of materials or methods	1	2	3	4
5. Role playing	1	2	3	4
6. Audio-visual presentations (films, slides, videotapes, etc.)	1	2	3	4
7. Independent study	1	2	3	4

For each item below, I feel this characteristic is...	Not important			Very important
1. Inservice training should be based on specific objectives	1	2	3	4
2. Teachers should determine the content of inservice training	1	2	3	4
3. Inservice training activities for teachers should include administrators, also.	1	2	3	4
4. Building principals should provide leadership in planning inservice training	1	2	3	4
5. Inservice training should improve classroom performance	1	2	3	4
6. Inservice training should acquaint teachers with new materials and innovations	1	2	3	4
7. Inservice training should be conducted by selected teachers and administrators	1	2	3	4
8. Financial support of inservice training by the district should be a high priority	1	2	3	4
9. Inservice training should train teachers in interpersonal relations in the classroom	1	2	3	4
10. Every teacher should be involved in on-going inservice training	1	2	3	4
11. Inservice training should focus on a few topics rather than a mixture of offerings	1	2	3	4

(Complete information on other side)

1. Name_____

2. School district_____ 3. City_____

4. Position (circle one) principal teacher superintendent

coordinator aide other_____

5. Grade levels taught (circle all appropriate) 7 8 9 10 11 12 n/a

6. Degree held (circle one)

None A.A. B.A. Specialist

Ph.D. Other

7. Position experience (circle one)

0-5 years 6-10 years 11-15 years

16-20 years More

8. Work phone (if any)_____

THE NORTHERN INSTITUTE
For
Research, Training and Development, Inc.

650 West International Airport Road • Anchorage, Alaska 99502
Phone (907) 274-3691

November 2, 1978

Dear

We have recently received a grant from the Alaska State Department of Education to conduct a statewide vocational education survey. The survey will look at the impact that inservice training has had on our vocational educators in the state. Vocational education teachers as well as administrators and paraprofessionals involved in vocational education will be the focus of the survey.

A member of our staff was in touch with your district recently and your name was given as the district-level administrator responsible for vocational education. We are in need of your assistance in conducting this survey. Please find the enclosed survey forms in this envelope. We would like you to do the following:

(1) distribute the survey forms to each vocational education teacher, administrator and paraprofessional in your district;

(2) instruct them to complete the survey, staple it closed and drop it into the mail (the return address as well as the postage has been provided).

The survey form is self-explanatory and only requires a few minutes to complete. However, all of the information requested is necessary to allow us to complete the survey analysis.

We appreciate your assistance in conducting this vocational education survey and will be in touch with you in the future. Please contact our office immedidately if you need any assistance. Copies of the survey findings will be available to you upon request after December 31, 1978.

Sincerely,

Richard A. Whitney, Director
Research and Evaluation Division

/gb

An Equal Opportunity Employer

Alaska School Districts Responding
to
Vocational Education Survey

Alaska Central Railbelt Schools
Alaska Gateway School District
Anchorage School District
Annette Island Schools
Bering Strait Schools
Bristol Bay Borough Schools
Chatham Schools
Chugach Schools
Copper River Schools
Cordova City Schools
Delta/Greely Schools
Dillingham City Schools
Fairbanks North Star Borough Schools
Galena City Schools
Haines Borough Schools
Hoonah City Schools
Hydaburg City Schools
Iditarod Area School District
Juneau Borough Schools
Kake City Schools
Kenai Peninsula Borough Schools
Ketchikan Gateway Schools
King Cove City Schools
Kodiak Aleutian Regional High School
Kuspuk Schools
Lower Kuskokwim School District
Matanuska/Susitna Borough Schools
Nenana City Schools
Nome Public Schools
North Slope Borough Schools
Pelican City Schools
Petersburg City Schools
Pribilof Island Schools
Sitka Borough Schools
Skagway City Schools
Southeast Island Schools
Southwest Region Schools
St. Mary's School District
Valdez City Schools
Wrangell City Schools
Yakutat City Schools
Yukon/Koyukuk Schools
Lake and Peninsula Schools